

LAW OFFICES
414 UNION STREET, SUITE 1600
POST OFFICE BOX 198062
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37219

March 2, 2001

REC'D TH REGULATORY AUTH.

'01 MAR 5 PM 12 30

OFFICE OF THE TELEPHONE (615) 244-2582

EXECUTIVE SECONDIF (615) 244-2582

INTERNET WEB http://www.bccb.com/

Mr. David Waddell Executive Secretary Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243-0505

In Re: Petition for Interconnection Arbitration by DIECA Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company, Inc. Against BellSouth Telecommunications,

Inc.

Docket No. 00-01130

Dear David:

Henry Walker

(615) 252-2363

Fax: (615) 252-6363 Email: hwalker@bccb.com

Please find enclosed the original and thirteen copies of a replacement cover letter for a filing made by Covad Communications Company's regarding Objections to BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s First Interrogatories and First Request for Production of Documents in the above captioned proceeding. The cover letter attached to the filing on March 2, 2001 contained the wrong caption. We apologize for any inconvenience.

BOULT, CUMMINGS, CONNERS & BERRY, PLC

By:

Henry Walker

HW/nl Attachment c: Parties

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

In re:)	
Petition for Interconnection Arbitration	Ć	
By DIECA Communications, Inc., d/b/a)	Docket No. 00-01130
Covad Communications Company, Inc.)	
Against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.)	

OBJECTIONS OF COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY TO BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S FIRST INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

DIECA Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad Communication Company ("Covad") makes the following objections to Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents served on it by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth").

INTERROGATORIES

2. Please identify each of the work steps involved when BellSouth provisions an xDSL loop to a CLEC.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it requests information that is solely in the possession of BellSouth and its affiliates. The extent to which Covad understands BellSouth's xDSL loop provisioning process is based upon representations and statements made by BellSouth to Covad, other CLECs, and regulatory agencies. As a result, Covad has no independent means of verifying whether that process is as BellSouth claims it to be.

4. Please identify each customer which has "demand[ed]" that Covad inform them "when Covad can provide them with DSL service" as described in Paragraph 17 of the Petition.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, and requests information not reasonably related to the resolution of any issue raised by Covad's Petition for Arbitration. In addition, Covad objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it requests information that would cause Covad to violate customer proprietary network information rules, confidentiality clauses in customer contracts, and other applicable consumer protection or privacy rules, standards or requirements.

5. Please state the basis for your statement in Paragraph 19 of the Petition that "[i]n two years of operation in the BellSouth territory, BellSouth has repeatedly and unilaterally cancelled Covad unbundled loop orders – oftentimes on the date BellSouth originally promised to provide the loop (the FOC date)." In responding to this interrogatory, separately identify each and every instance of cancellation.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome because it would require Covad to sift through over a thousand orders and individually note cancellations. In addition, Covad objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it requests information that would cause Covad to violate customer proprietary network information rules, confidentiality clauses in customer contracts, and other applicable consumer protection or privacy rules, standards or requirements. Additionally, since BellSouth cancelled these orders, BellSouth has this information in its possession or control.

8. Please identify each central office in which Covad believes POTS splitters were installed improperly as stated in Paragraph 38 of the Petition.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it requires Covad to speculate about information exclusively in the hands of BellSouth and about which BellSouth may or may not have provided Covad adequate, complete or accurate information.

11. Please identify every assumption supporting BellSouth's proposed rates which you believe is flawed, as asserted in Paragraph 42 of the Petition

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this interrogatory as unduly broad, overly burdensome, and procedurally premature and defective, at least to the extent it requests information from Covad more appropriately raised in direct testimony upon completion of discovery. With respect to collocation rates, BellSouth has not produced to Covad a cost study supporting it new rates in Tennessee. Therefore, Covad has nothing to critique.

12. Please identify every task time supporting BellSouth's proposed rates which you believe is inflated, as asserted in Paragraph 42 of the Petition.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this interrogatory as unduly broad, overly burdensome, and procedurally premature and defective, at least to the extent it requests information from Covad more appropriately raised in direct testimony upon completion of discovery.

13. Please identify every work group supporting BellSouth's proposed rates which you believe is unnecessary, as asserted in Paragraph 42 of the Petition.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this interrogatory as unduly broad, overly burdensome, and procedurally premature and defective, at least to the extent it requests information from Covad more appropriately raised in direct testimony upon completion of discovery.

14. Please identify each loop model from which BellSouth's proposed rates are derived and identify every respect in which those loop models "do not comply with TELRIC" as stated in Paragraph 42 of the Petition.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this interrogatory as unduly broad, overly burdensome, and procedurally premature and defective, at least to the extent it requests information from Covad more appropriately raised in direct testimony upon completion of discovery.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION

1. Please produce a copy of every document in your possession which refers or relates to any of the responses you provided to the foregoing Interrogatories.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this Request for Production No. 1 on the basis that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous and not reasonably related or tailored to the subject matter of any issue presented in Covad's Petition for Arbitration. Furthermore, Covad objects to the Request on the grounds that it includes a request for documents that may be subject to the attorney-client and/or attorney work product privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION

2. Please produce a copy of any correspondence between Covad and BellSouth

concerning the ordering or provisioning of any unbundled network elements and/or any request

for collocation space.

OBJECTION:

Covad objects to this Request for Production No. 2 on the basis that it is overbroad,

unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably related or tailored to the subject

matter of any issue presented in Covad's Petition for Arbitration. For example, because

BellSouth has failed to implement electronic ordering systems, Covad has been forced in place

order via facsimile. Presumably, every order ever faxed to BellSouth, every service order ever

faxed to BellSouth, and every clarification or jeopardy notice ever received by Covad would be

encompassed within this request. Furthermore, Covad objects to this request on the grounds that

it requests production of information already in the possession or control of BellSouth.

Furthermore, this request would presumably require Covad to produce every collocation

application ever submitted to BellSouth, an entirely wasteful and unnecessary process, since

BellSouth presumably has these applications.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DATA COALITION

Henry Walker, E

Boult, Cummings, Conners & Berry, PLC

414 Union Street

Suite 1600

P.O. 198062

Nashville, TN 37219

6

Catherine F. Boone Covad Communications Company 10 Glenlake Parkway, Suite 650 Atlanta, Georgia 30328

Eric J. Branfman Joshua M. Bobeck Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP 3000 K Street, NW Suite 300 Washington, DC 20007-5116

Counsel for Broadslate Networks of Tennessee, Inc.

John Kerkorian MGC Communications, Inc., d/b/a Mpower Communications Corp. 5607 Glenridge Drive, Suite 310 Atlanta, GA 30342

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been forwarded via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, and/or hand delivered to the following on this the 2nd day of March, 2001.

Guy Hicks, Esq.
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
Suite 2101
333 Commerce Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37201-3300

Jim Lamoureux AT&T 1200 Peachtree St., NE Room 4060 Atlanta, GA 30309

James Wright, Esq. United Telephone Southeast 14111 Capitol Blvd. Wake Forest, NC 27587

Charles B. Welch, Esq. Farris, Mathews, Branan & Hellen PLC 205 Capitol Blvd., Suite 303 Nashville, TN 37219

R. Dale Grimes, Esq. Bass, Berry & Sims, LC 2700 First American Center Nashville, TN 37238-2700

Dana Shaffer, Esq. XO Tennessee, Inc. 105 Molloy St., Suite 300 Nashville, TN 37201

Clay Arendes, Esq. Vectris Telecom, Inc. 6500 River Place Blvd. Building 2, Suite 200 Austin, TX 78730 Susan Berlin, Esq.
MCI Telecommunications d/b/a
MCI WorldCom
6 Concourse Parkway
Atlanta, GA 30328

Bennett Ross, Esq. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 675 W. Peachtree St., Suite 4300 Atlanta, GA 30375

John Spilman
Director of Regulatory Affairs and
Industry Relations
BroadSlate Networks, Inc.
675 Peter Jefferson Parkway, Suite 310
Charlottesville, VA 22911

Henry Walker